

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. No claims have been canceled or added. Claims 1, 7-10, and 19 have been amended. No new matter has been added by the claim amendments. Support for the claim amendments may be found throughout the specification as originally filed including, FIG. 5 and paragraphs 0052 and 0077. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are the independent claims.

### **Examiner Interview Summary**

Applicant appreciates Examiner Liu's time and attention during a telephonic interview with Applicant's representative, Michael A. Koptiw (Reg. No. 57,900) on June 23, 2008. During the interview, a proposed amendment was presented and discussed with respect to the standing rejection of the claims. Applicant and Examiner agreed that a similar amendment may be made in the present response for the Examiner's consideration.

### **Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph**

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action states that the feature "storing an indication" is not supported by the specification. While Applicant does not agree with the Office Action's assertion, Applicant has removed the noted language from the claims in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application on the merits. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph is moot in light of the claim amendments.

### **Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-6, 8-16, 18-19, and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0083917 to Tracey et al. ("Tracey"). Claims 7, 17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tracey in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0021355 to Brendle et al. ("Brendle").

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims patentably define over the cited references because the cited references fail to teach or suggest a context service that

matches first and second service entities having *different but related metadata attributes*, as claimed. Instead, Brendle does not address matching at all and Tracey teaches database records all in the *same* exact table format.

The present application provides for integrated management of different service entities in connection with respective different application services connected by a network (See Specification FIG 5). To illustrate, in a loan approval computer system, one service application may be a “credit history” component and the second application service may be a “down payment” component (Specification 0002).

To further illustrate, these two application services may each operate with respect to respective different data service entities, for example the exemplary applicant entity 215(a) and the exemplary loan entity 215(b) as reproduced below (Specification 0035). Even though the service entities may contain similar data (e.g., an account name), they may be stored with metadata attributes that have different labels and structure but use related keywords (e.g., “applicant” and “name”).

<u>Exemplary Applicant Entity 215a</u>	<u>Exemplary Loan Entity 215b</u>
<applicant> <ID> 1 </ID> <first name> John </first name> <last name> Smith </last name> </applicant>	<loan> <ID> 10 </ID> <applicant> <name> John Smith </name> </applicant> </loan>

In enabling an integrated management of these components, the system provides for running a context service that matches the first and second service entities having different but related metadata attributes, as recited in the claims.

In contrast, Tracey teaches a database system with bin records all in the *same* exact table format. The Office Action notes Tracey's function of grouping debtor accounts into deskbins (Office Action dated 4/3/2008 – p. 5). However, the data being related into deskbins do not have *different but related* metadata attributes, as now claimed. Rather, they come from the *same* table. Specifically, debtor accounts are sorted into bins according to

entries in the bin table, reproduced below (Tracey, FIG. 2, 0158 & 0208). Because the bin table has a single schema, the records stored in it cannot be said to have different but related metadata attributes. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Tracey does not teach or suggest a context service that matches first and second service entities having different but related metadata attributes, as claimed.

BIN TABLE

DEBTOR ID#	BIN	SUB-BIN	BIN ITEM#	126
---------------	-----	---------	-----------	-----

The Office Action did not assert that Brendle is related to matching service entities, and Applicant submits that it is not. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claimed features, and that the claims patentably define over cited references.

Furthermore, with respect to independent claim 10, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach a first service entity that is an extensible markup language data associated with a first distinct application service and a second service entity that is an extensible markup language data associated with a second distinct application service, as claimed. Applicant submits that the cited references do not teach or suggest a first distinct application service being connected via a network to a second distinct application service, as claimed. Applicant submits that the cited references do not teach or suggest determining if an action is available to be performed on a first service entity in response to a selection of the first service entity.

For at least the foregoing reasons and amendments, Applicant submits that the claims patentably define over the cited references. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and a notice of allowance for claims 1-23.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-1949 / 301416.1  
**Application No.:** 10/648,506  
**Office Action Dated:** April 3, 2008

**PATENT**

Date: July 2, 2008

/Michael A. Koptiw/  
Michael A. Koptiw  
Registration No. 57,900

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439